



**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20554**

July 2, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Andrew Ferguson
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 5961
P.O. Box 55819
Boston, MA 02205-5819

Re: Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request No. 2013-353

Dear Mr. Mullen:

This responds to your FOIA request dated June 10, 2013, to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission), for documents pertaining to the identities and actions taken against unsolicited calls from "Account Services" and/or "Cardholder Services."

We have searched our files and located one record, totaling four pages, which is responsive to your request. The record, generally described, is a citation, dated March 2, 2007, that the Commission issued to Cardholder Services, Inc. (Cardholder Services), in our file EB-07-TC-604. The citation is publicly available at <http://transition.fcc.gov/eb/Orders/2007/DA-07-977A1.html>. As a courtesy, we are providing you with the citation along with this response.

Please note that the FCC works closely and cooperatively with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), which also has jurisdiction over robocall and do-not-call issues. We share information and complaints, insuring that our agencies effectively and efficiently address unlawful activities. In October 2012, the FTC held a one-day public event to discuss challenges and develop solutions to the rapid rise in illegal robocalls. The summit included FTC, FCC, and industry panelists, and focused on an exploration of potential technological solutions to the problem of illegal robocalls. A few weeks after the summit, the FTC announced a major law enforcement effort against five companies allegedly responsible for millions of illegal prerecorded calls from "Rachel" and others from "Cardholder Services." The FTC filed complaints against the entities in federal district courts in Arizona and Florida, which granted the FTC's request to temporarily halt these robocall operations immediately. In addition to alleging that the entities made unlawful telemarketing calls, the FTC's complaints alleged that the calls were deceptive or fraudulent. According to the FTC, the violators deceived consumers into

Mr. Andrew Ferguson
July 2, 2013
Page 2 of 2

paying hundreds or thousands of dollars by making phony claims that they could reduce credit card interest rates in return for an upfront fee.

For the purpose of fee assessment, you were categorized as a "News Media/Educational/Non-commercial Scientific" requester, who must pay for reproducing records in excess of the first 100 pages.¹ There is no fee associated with processing your request.

I hope this response proves helpful

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RAH', with a large, loopy initial 'R' on the left and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Richard A. Hindman
Chief
Telecommunications Consumers Division
Enforcement Bureau

Enclosure

¹ 47 C.F.R. § 0.470(a)(2).